

## Appendix A: Environmental Significance Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. Where the checklist determination is something other than “no impact”, the associated environmental topic is further discussed in Chapter 2 of the environmental document. A table summarizing the reasons for each “no impact” determination appears in Chapter 2.

### Environmental Significance Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district might be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS: Would the project:				
Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
j) Inundation by tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
XI. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XIV. RECREATION:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing or new entitlements and resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

## Appendix B: Title VI Policy Statement

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND TRADING AGENCY

ARNOLD S. BARNETT, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR  
1100 N STREET  
P. O. BOX 942373  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95823-0001  
PHONE (916) 654-5266  
FAX (916) 654-6808  
TTY (916) 654-4086



*Use your power!  
Be wisely efficient!*

January 14, 2005

### TITLE VI POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, ensures that no person in the State of California shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity it administers.

  
WILL KEMPTON  
Director

*"Caltrans improves mobility across California"*



# Appendix C: Response to Comments

## Summary

During the comment period, Caltrans received comments by electronic mail and by regular mail. The comments received by electronic mail and by regular mail were from State Agencies, local organizations, and individuals. No comments were received from any Federal Agencies.

### 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone

A number of comments recommended further consideration and evaluation of alternatives to the buffer zone as a means to relieving existing safety concerns. Suggestions included a median barrier, and a 4 lane facility.

#### • 1.1 Concrete median barrier

Board members of the Community Services District of Discovery Bay and attendees expressed a preference for a Concrete Barrier Option at the December 5, 2007 briefing by Caltrans staff with respect to the recommended Build Alternative.

*Response: The criteria for installation of median barriers on State highways is usually applied to freeway applications. On non-freeway routes, the installation of a median barrier is usually applied to multiple lane conventional highways (four or more lanes). The installation of a median barrier on a two lane conventional highway is not a typical application and only done under certain circumstances. When there are a large number of cross median accidents involving fatalities on a high speed rural conventional highway then a median barrier may be considered, but only when other less extreme measures are taken first.*

*If a concrete median barrier was installed on the two lane segments within the project limits, then other issues would be raised that would have to be addressed in order to implement the addition of a barrier. First of all cost, which would be considerable, including the need for attenuators at each blunt end of the barrier at the various openings in the barrier to accomodate private driveways as well as the overall beginning and end of the barriers. Sight distance criteria would have to be*

implemented at the openings at the driveways. The question of how many driveways should be accommodated would have to be addressed; some private driveways are very close to each other.

Each end of the barrier is a blunt end that can be hit, even with an attenuator. In the AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) Guide to Geometric Design of Highways and Streets Manual dated 2004, under the subject 'Median Barriers', page 334, it is stated that "Careful consideration should be given to the installation of median barriers on multilane expressways or other highways with partial control of access." "Consequently, an evaluation of the number of median openings, crash history, alignment, sight distance, design speed, traffic volume, and median width should be conducted prior to installation of median barriers on non-freeway facilities."

In 1994 raised profiled thermoplastic striping (rumble strips or 'rainline') were installed throughout this segment adjacent to the double yellow median striping to alert motorists when they were veering into and across the median by providing an audible and tactile warning when driven over. Most of the rumble strips are still in place and working. There was an immediate decline in cross over accidents after they were installed.

For all of the above reasons Caltrans does not think that the installation of a median barrier within the project limits would be practical. The proposed project to install a six foot wide buffer lane between the eastbound and westbound lanes of Route 4 would help to increase safety and decrease the chance of cross median accidents.

- 1.2 Four lane facility

Several comments were received requesting that a four lane configuration would be the best alternative to address safety and congestion concerns in the corridor.

Response: This project is a safety project whereby the scope and funding do not provide for capacity increase. The Caltrans Office of Traffic Safety initiated this project as a Safety Project under that Scope. Capacity increase issues should be addressed under a different project with different funding sources. A four lane design would also decrease access to cross streets.



## **2. Comments by letter**

### **2.1 Jackson, Carol (CJ), Individual**

**CJ1** I have just been informed that Cal Trans is planning to widen Hwy 4 to San Joaquin County Line. Why were the residents of Discovery Bay have not received notification. Mr. Piepho's own Agenda to increase the population of Discovery Bay continues to be hidden from the public in Discovery Bay. It has been stated that the CSD supports this project. The Directors of Discovery Bay were unaware of this Project. If Mr. Piepho informed Cal Trans the Board in support of this project, perhaps he needs to speak the Board members first before making that false statement. It will be presented at the Board meeting this evening without any review or comments by the people of Discovery Bay. There have been no studies done on this part of the roadway to verify if in fact those collisions etc that are being claim even exist. I respectfully request you place a hold on this project until community members have been notified. This is a continue effort by Mr. Piepho to expand this community without the approval of the community.

**Response:** *Your comment has been noted and is included in this final environmental document.*

### **2.2 Lennon, David T. (DL), Individual**

**DL1** While we favor highway widening and safety improvements we are unable to discern from the drawings provided what "typical section" CalTrans will be building. Some time ago Contra Costa County developed Precise Alignments and Rights of Way, which may call for a parkway landscape area between the edge of pavement and the Rights of Way. We encourage Caltrans to maintain the original Parkway approach and construct the proposed improvements in a manner which will further road prism being constructed in their ultimate location giving consideration to the parkway noted above.

**Response:** *See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

### 1.3. Musielak, James (JM), Individual

**JM1** Although it was stated in your proposal that this project would not impact noise, air quality or water quality I would like to point out that noise and air quality are an issue already which will only increase with the widening of highway four behind Discovery Bay. While I agree with the need to improve Highway 4 because of head on traffic accidents you must also consider the people living on Highway 4. There is heavy truck traffic on this route and the widening of the highway will increase its use and also the noise and air pollution. The air quality will increase pollutants and lower the air standards. The pollutants from the diesel trucks and increase in traffic will lower the air quality. The increase in truck and automobile traffic will increase ground vibration and noise levels. The traffic noise has increased 100% since we moved here in 1990. The use of Jake brakes and horns and tires have also increased in excess levels. Our bedroom window faces highway 4 and if you move the highway closer to the back fence the noise level will also increase. The truck stacks go over the back fence and all the noise, polluted air and emissions end up in our back yard now. There is also a safety issue if traffic is moved closer to the back fence; one truck has already come through the back wall. Significant environmental hazards already exist. The need for a sound wall is essential now. The noise levels exceed a safe environment standard at this time without the increase of Highway 4. I would like to have a noise and air environment team over to our yard for evaluation. A substantial permanent increase in noise and air quality has occurred in this area.

**Response:** This project does not propose any additional lanes and will not increase capacity along Sstate Route 4 in this area. Also, this project is identified as Type I based on Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol issued in 2006. Type I projects includes activities that may create a new noise source and move the traffic closer to a receiver. Because of a short auxiliary lane in this area, additional noise analysis is required. Two houses located at 13251 Bryon and 13245 Byron are potentially affected. Field measurements at the two residential units indicate that the existing peak noise level approaches 68 dBA. This noise level qualifies these houses for a soundwall. However, construction of a soundwall is not feasible since it will cut off access to the residential dwellings. Furthermore, the future predicted exterior noise level would not equal or exceed 75 dBA. Therefore, the houses do not qualify for sound insulation.

### 1.4. Public Utilities Commission (PUC), Organization



PUC1 As the state agency responsible for rail safety within California, we recommend that any development projects planned adjacent to or near the rail corridor in the county be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind.

*Response: Caltrans will work with the PUC to ensure that safety concerns associated with rail traffic will addressed.*

PUC2 Of specific concern is that widening towards the Union Pacific Railroad line will reduce vehicle storage between Highway 4 and the Tracks, which may cause larger vehicles to queue onto the track. The above-mentioned safety improvements should be considered when approval is sought for the new development. Working with commission staff early in the conceptual design phase will help improve the safety to motorist and pedestrians in the county.

*Response: This project does not propose any additional lanes and will not increase capacity along state Route 4 in this area. We are also concerned about motorist and pedestrian safety and will work with PUC staff, as necessary, throughout the project's development process.*

### 1.5. State Clearing House (SCH), State Agency

SCH1 The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on November 13, 2007, and no state agencies submitted comment by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

*No response is necessary.*

### 1.6. Zook, Harley & Wanda (H&WZ), Individuals

H&WZ1 Highway Noise is a problem. My Husband Harley G. Zook and I live at 13401 Highway 4, Contra Costa County, Byron District, California. Our house is on the south side of Highway 4 near the Highway 4 and J4, a.k.a. Byron Highway, junction. Although, my house sits within feet of Highway 4, it is seldom visible from the Highway due to the trees and vegetation. In your research, per the latest printout that we received via mail, it was stated that the noise level was not a problem anywhere along the stretch

of Highway to be widened. I beg to differ. Although, my husband and I do not complain, the noise has been a constant factor in our lives. I seldom sit outside due to the ever-increasing noise. I keep my television or radio on the help drown out the noise and if I am interested in something on the TV or radio, I am constantly adjusting the volume to compensate for the noise coming from the highway. Many times, I have been awakened during the night by motorcycles picking up speed in front of my house as they head east on Highway 4 from the J4 & Highway 4 junction. When large trucks coming from the east brake for the stoplight, not only do we hear the braking, but also we feel the vibration that occasionally turns on my porch lights or causes things to fall. I'm sure the vibration is caused by the high water table which is within a few feet of the surface except during the late summer and early fall of the year. Another noise factor has been from the farm tractors working in the fields 24 hours a day during the field preparation and harvest. The noise has also been a factor for our neighbors whose homes sit back off the highway. Please contact them if in doubt, as they did not receive any notification about the upcoming Highway 4 construction.

***Response: This project does not propose any additional lanes and will not increase capacity and traffic noise along State Route 4 in this area. Also, this project is identified as Type I per the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol issued in 2006. Two houses located at 13251 Bryon and 13245 Byron are potentially affected. Field measurements at the two residential units indicate that the existing peak noise level approaches 68 dBA. This noise level qualifies these houses for a soundwall. However, construction of a soundwall is not feasible since it will cut off access to the residential dwellings. Furthermore, the future predicted exterior noise level would not equal or exceed 75 dBA. Therefore, the houses do not qualify for sound insulation.***

**H&WZ2** Personal Safety is a problem for us regarding accidents where single vehicles have left the road and would up wrecking and landing on our property.

***Response: Safety improvements proposed by this project will reduce the incidences of single vehicle accidents. The median buffer zone will provide an audible and tactile warning to drivers, and the wider shoulders will enable drivers to recover from mishaps.***

**H&WZ3** Road Visibility from our driveway and Willow Way is not a problem. Since a buffer is to be placed down the middle of Highway 4, why not make the buffer a little wider to allow room for vehicles to turn around that have missed the J4 and Highway 4



Interchange. This would also allow space for left hand turns into and from our driveway and Willow Way. The stoplights at both Bixler Rd. & Highway 4 and J4 & Highway 4 junctions, spaces traffic, which would make this, in all likely hood, a good thing.

**Response:** *The median buffer zone is not designed for use as a lane for vehicle travel. The cost and scope of the current project does not allow for this feature at this time. Cost permitting, access improvements may be studied during the Design phase.*

**H&WZ4** Now I know that many people do not like the trucks or tractors. They are hard to see around, they drive slower than other traffic, they are difficult to pass, and they can't stop as quickly as cars or pickups. Personally, I know they are necessary. People want their food and other commodities, but, they don't want to make any sacrifice or concession to receive the. I give all trucks the right-of-way whenever possible, but I also will let tailgaters pass by me as well. I know that the tailgater, is much more likely to cause an accident involving a truck or other vehicle due to their reckless and irresponsible behavior. Yet, the truck driver will be blamed because they couldn't stop quickly enough after being cut off by the passing tailgater who slams on his brakes when a slower vehicle, which the truck had been following, causes the passing tailgater to cut back into his lane due to oncoming traffic. None of the numerous accidents in front of my home and property were caused by a truck or piece of equipment. They have all been caused by cars or pickups driven by people that have lost control of their vehicles for whatever reason. Most of the accidents have only involved a single vehicle, which wound up landing on either my property or the property across the road. A median, unless it includes a concrete barrier, will not stop this from happening. A sound wall is the only thing that will keep them from my property. The trees at least are stopping them now.

**Response:** *See See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

**H&WZ5** I realize that it has been determined that median or buffer down the middle of Highway 4 will be the main object for safety, and in some ways I agree, but for the most part, that is not the problem here in front of my home and property. From the end of my driveway, the visibility is usually very good looking in either direction thus, the traffic can be seen coming for over a mile away. Of the accidents in front of my property the past two years, nearly all were by people that seemed to be trying to straighten the curve at the junction of J4 and Highway 4. I do not know the reason that they have gone airborne and landed on our property; I just know that they have. If it wasn't for the trees,



fence and shrubbery, I don't know how much damage would have been done to our property. The year before last, a man drunk or high on something, lost control coming east around the curve. The first thing he hit was a tree about 8 inches in diameter. The tree was broken in two but it at least slowed him down. He then spun around and landed with his bumper on the fence along our property and slid down the shoulder for about 50 feet wiping out all the vegetation as he went. Last year a lady, lost control and hit a large eucalyptus on our property, which is what stopped her vehicle. Fortunately, she was not injured. The problem now is that the tree is no longer there to stop anyone because, although it was more than two feet in diameter, it broke in two where her car hit it, thus the severely damaged tree had to be totally removed.

***Response: Safety improvements proposed by this project will reduce the incidences of single vehicle accidents. As part of this project, the curve radius will be modified and site distance will be improved to meet current standard requirements. The median buffer zone will also provide an audible and tactile warning to drivers, and the wider shoulders will enable drivers to recover from mishaps.***

**H&WZ6** Since our purchase of this property in 1999, people have been life-flighted out of our yard at least four times that I know of. My husband and I are gone frequently and do not know of all the accidents that happen in front of our house unless someone tells us. In the past, we could tell that an accident had happened in front of our property due to the evidence left on our property following the accident; as frequently, the vehicles had been removed by the time we got home.

***Response: According to the current accident data, the fatal plus injury accidents in the project limits are below the state average. Also, safety improvements proposed by this project will reduce the incidences of single vehicle accidents. As part of this project, the sight distances will be improved to meet current standard requirements.***

**H&WZ7** Our main concern is that the large trees and shrubs between our house and the highway will be removed leaving our home out in the open. As is, the trees, not only help keep the noise down, but they keep vehicles from driving through our home. To some degree, the large trees can be a hazard, as last fall a large branch fell off the tree and landed just missing our house. Then over the Christmas holidays while we were gone out of state, a large tree fell through our fence, over into our yard, just missing our house again. It was an extremely large tree that stood between our house and Highway 4. We

do not know why it fell, just that it fell. My husband cut the tree up, but chose to leave the large root system turned on its edge in place, as it also would still work as a barrier between our house and the vehicles on Highway 4.

**Response:** *Since the project limits fall within a conventional highway, Department policy states that no new highway planting be provided. However, it appears that some developer landscaping might have the potential to be affected by the proposed project. Since the project will affect wetlands, and an existing stand of mature trees, Caltrans will assess the need for a visual impact analysis and/or scenic resources evaluation planting and erosion control treatment of the proposed side slopes.*

**H&WZ8** Another problem, which we have experienced with the trees and shrubs, is that people use them for an outdoor bathroom as well as homeless people setting up camp. We have had to call the police on more than one occasion to have homeless people removed, as we were afraid of fires being set. My husband has then gone out and cleaned up the area, which was at times, left quit nasty.

**Response:** *For problems associated with homeless people illegally encamped in the State highway right of way, please contact Caltrans and we will work with the California Highway Patrol to rectify the situation.*

**H&WZ9** Now, as to the installation of a turnaround at the junction of Willow Way and Highway 4, although, it has an imaginary buffer down the middle of Highway 4, numerous people use that intersection for a turn around on a daily basis. As far as I know, there has not been an accident in that location to date. As previously stated, the visibility is over a mile in all directions from that location. The imaginary buffer has been a terrible inconvenience for those of us that live here though, as we have to drive at least 4 miles out of our way just to get back to our house when going to the post office or other points east.

**Response:** *The median buffer zone is not designed for use as a lane for vehicle travel, but as a safety component. The median buffer zone will also provide an audible and tactile warning to drivers, and the wider shoulders will enable drivers to recover from mishaps. Cost permitting, access improvements may be studied during the Design phase.*



H&WZ10 Other than making the trees look ugly, we don't mind them trimming them back to keep them from falling over or getting into the high line wires. Nor, do we have any objection to a sound wall being installed should the trees need to be removed for the widening of the road since one of the previous owners had moved the driveway from in front of our house to its current location several yards east of our home.

**Response:** Your comment has been noted and is included in this final environmental document.

## **2. Oral Comments at the Board Meeting Presentation**

### **2.1. Dove, Dave (DD), Discovery Bay Board Director**

DD1 And There was a discrepancy in the dates on the initial study as to the deadline for comment.

**Response:** Due to confusion about the deadline for closure of the comment period, the comment period was extended to December 6, 2007. Comments after this date were also accepted.

DD2 I Document stated that there was support from Discovery Bay

**Response:** The support was from the initial task force to make SR 12 and roads around Discovery Bay safer.

### **2.2. Doran, Bob (BD), Discovery Bay Board Director - Vice President**

AC1 Commented that he was concerned about the area along Highway 4 for the Town's landscaping and asked that the expansion be on the other side of the road from our landscaping.

**Response:** Public concerns about landscaping and aesthetics issues will be addressed further during final design of the project.

### **2.3. Knight, Patty(PK), Discovery Bay Board Director - Treasurer**



PK1 Asked about the notifications process on this type of project.

*Response: Notification was provided to the property owners up to two miles off the highway.*

#### 2.4. Koehne, Virgil (VK), Discovery Bay Board Director – General Manager

VK1 He commented that Contra Costa Water District has a large project coming on Victoria Island, which will require a large amount of truck traffic for the construction. This traffic will be going through Discovery Bay and on to the levee road to Stockton.

*Response: Impacts associated with truck traffic during construction will be addressed in a Transportation Management Plan that will be prepared with input from Discovery Bay. Caltrans will work with the Water District to ensure that traffic concerns are diminished.*

VK2 He also commented that San Joaquin County has built a new entrance onto Highway 5 from the Port of Stockton and he feels this will create a lot more truck traffic to and from there through Discovery Bay.

*Response: Problems of increased truck traffic on SR 4 through Discovery Bay should be directed to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, which can initiate studies and projects to address this problem or raise this concern to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Caltrans.*

VK3 He asked if either a cable barrier or a four lane highway was considered when designing this project, or what other type of options were considered?

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

VK4 He also commented that the Town on the north side of both of the bridges, Kellogg Creek and Kendall, or Fritz Creek, has a water and sewer main on the north edge and a fiber optic line, so staff would like to ask that they avoid and expand to the south by those bridges.

*Response: The current design plan calls for an alignment to the south at these locations.*

## 2.5. Piepho, David (DP), Discovery Bay Board Director - President

DP1 The conflict of dates on the document was very confusing. He also commented that he had been on the task force from the beginning asking for various improvements to the roads around Discovery Bay. He asked if there could be any K-Rail or divider in the middle of Highway 4 in front of Discovery Bay. He stated that he is concerned about the hourglass effect of our road especially now with the By-Pass widening it will be dumping these cars onto the Highway in front of Discovery Bay. He also commented about the deadline for comment being 12/06/07. He asked how the comments should be made and will they be taken even if after the deadline.

Response: Caltrans environmental staff indicated at the meeting that comments received after the closure date are still accepted in keeping with the intent of environmental laws requiring public disclosure and input. The final environmental document will be prepared by Summer 2008.

Caltrans Traffic Safety staff indicated that a median barrier would not be needed in this project. Caltrans has found that buffer areas and rumble strips have been used effectively elsewhere to reduce the rate of accidents.

## 2.6. Several Audience Members (SAM), Discovery Bay residents

SAM1 commented that the highway in front of Discovery Bay was full of funnels where the road widens to two lanes and then back to one lane and repeat the same again to the bridge.

Response: The extra lanes in and around the Discovery Bay area are intended to provide adequate space for deceleration and acceleration of vehicles making turning movements at intersections. They are designed to increase safety at these locations and not to increase traffic capacity. This project is not funded as a congestion relief project. . On SR 4 from 0.2 mile south of Marsh Creek Road to 0.2 mile east of Byron Highway intersection, a new standard lane will be added in westbound direction to match the number of lanes of the SR4 Bypass project and in turn improve traffic operations between the two at the intersections.



SAM2 commented that the majority of our accidents that block the road are on the bridge going to Stockton.

*Response: Additional improvements to the San Joaquin Bridge are outside the cost and scope of this project. Capacity of the facility at the bridge will likely be studied by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority as well as Caltrans to determine improvements that might be needed. Regional and corridor improvements are also being studied and will be implemented when funding is available.*

SAM3 commented that we need a median barrier in front of Discovery Bay.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

SAM4 commented that there is extensive big rig truck traffic on Highway 4 in front of Discovery Bay and that it be considered when planning this project

*Response: Problems of increased truck traffic on SR 4 through Discovery Bay should be directed to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, which can initiate studies and projects to address this problem or raise this concern to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Caltrans.*

## 2.7. Audience Members (AM), representing Discovery Bay residents

AM1 commented that they could use the cost of the rumble strips to put in a median barrier instead.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

AM2 commented that Highway 4 in front of Discovery Bay was supposed to be a four-lane highway by the conditions of approval for the development of Discovery Bay, this was supposed to have been done by the developer twenty nine-years ago, and it was never done, why? He stated that the developer had been sued and the award had been given to the property owners up and down the corridor and the road was never done.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

**AM3** He further asked why there is now not enough money to make it the four-lane highway that it was suppose to be in the first place.

**Response:** *See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

**AM4** He further commented that the one lane bride at the end of Highway 4 going toward Stockton is insufficient to accept the traffic coming from the Brentwood/Byron side of Discovery Bay.

**Response:** *Capacity of the facility at the bridge will likely be studied by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority as well as Caltrans to determine improvements that might be needed*

**AM5** asked that Caltrans looked at the traffic coming from the Port of Stockton and could they get together with the Caltrans area that handles the road past Discovery Bay and the bridge all the way to Stockton for an improvement to a four lane road all the way through.

**Response:** *See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

**AM6** asked if Caltrans had taken into consideration the extra traffic that the Highway 4 By-Pass will create or any traffic that will be created by future development.

**Response:** *Although the Bypass consists of a new four-lane divided highway between the SR 4/SR 160 junction and Balfour Road, the present connection with this project is a conventional two-lane highway. This configuration will match and be consistent with the proposed project and will provide an additional north /south route to the existing State Route 4. The combination of these two projects will not cause any new significant impacts to the region and is consistent with the intent of the General Plan.*

**AM7** commented that there was no right turn onto Discovery Bay Boulevard on the layout design that was brought to the office for the presentation. He commented that the arrows were pointing straight westbound.

**Response:** *Error has been noted and plans will be corrected during final design of the project.*



AM8 asked about Oleanders as a barrier or other plants.

*Response: The use of oleanders and shrub-trees would be new obstacles that vehicles may hit, as well as limiting sight distances for motorists. In addition, oleanders and shrub-trees would require ongoing maintenance costs while the State budget is becoming more limited. However, it appears that some developer landscaping might have the potential to be impacted by the proposed project. Since the project will impact wetlands, and an existing stand of mature trees, Environmental Planning would assess the need for a visual impact analysis and/or scenic resources evaluation.*

### 3. Comments by electronic mail

#### **3.1. Brodie, Colin (CB), Individual**

CB1 In addition to widening Kellogg Creek Bridge to provide standard shoulders and a 6 foot buffer zone. We also need 4 lanes for the entire route. Caltrans should expand the entire project to 4 lanes from Marsh Creek to the Contra Costa County line.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

#### **3.2. Dove, Amanda (AD), Individual**

AD1 So, I understand Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study/Proposal, which examines the potential environmental impacts of widening State Route 4 from Marsh Creek Road to .2 miles west of the Contra Costa / San Joaquin County line. The project proposes to construct a 6 foot buffer zone between opposing traffic lanes. The outside shoulders, currently 0 to 8 feet wide, will be upgraded to meet current 8 foot standards for errant vehicle recovery and to provide an area whereby emergency vehicles can pull out when needed for assistance. The project also proposes to widen Kellogg Creek Bridge to provide standard shoulders and a 6 foot buffer zone. This project is called the "State Route 4 Median Buffer Zone Project". The project will NOT provide 4 lanes the entire route. As a Discovery Bay business owner and long-time resident, I request that Caltrans consider expanding the entire project to 4 lanes from Marsh Creek to the Contra Costa County line.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

### 3.3. Hess, Gary (GH), Individual

GH1 I have just finished reviewing your document for the widening of Hwy. 4. It is a good plan, but it doesn't go far enough. If you can provide two lanes for the west bound traffic from Bixler to Marsh Creek, why not two lanes from Old River Bridge to the entrance of Discovery Bay? East bound traffic plans are inadequate to accommodate the heavy truck traffic that will come from Marsh Creek heading toward Stockton. My strong recommendation is to provide 4 lanes from Marsh Creek to the Old River Bridge.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

GH2 Additional funding may be obtained from the Mormon Church as they were awarded over 15 millions dollars after suing the Hofmann Company for their failure to widen Hwy. 4.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

### 3.4. Lenahan, Michelle (ML), Individual

ML1 I beg of you to please widen Highway 4 from Marsh Creek to the Contra Costa County line to FOUR LANES. As an 11 year resident of Discovery Bay I have watched the traffic increase exponentially and I know that it is only going to get worse as the Lakes development continues to grow and the Chechini property (already approved and within the urban limit line) is developed.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*

ML2 The With the Bypass finally being completed it is already obsolete with only 2 lanes. That is obvious by the traffic that backs up on segment 2 which has been opened for 5 years.

*Response: See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone*



ML3 PLEASE, let's be proactive and build a road that is planned for the already approved growth not just what is already here. It is so dissappointing to see the lack of planning for the future when it comes to our roads. Let this small segment be the first of many well planned road construction projects!!

*Response: Population growth is already occurring in Contra County County and in the Discovery Bay area without the improvements of the proposed project. The growth is the result of decisions on land use and development that have already been made as well as internally generated population growth in the Bay Area as children become adults and remain in the Bay Area. Caltrans encourages residents to become involved in the transportation planning and programming processes for Contra Costa County and the San Francisco Bay Area. With additional public input, sufficient funding may be made available to increase the capacity of SR 4 in the vicinity of Discovery Bay.*

### 3.5. Schwenke, Bob (BS), Individual

BS1 While attending the meeting last evening in Discovery Bay it became apparent that The Draft EIR is in fact not complete. Please understand that when I address "you" I am speaking to Caltrans and all of the people involved and not you personally.

A statement was made by one of the representatives of Caltrans that Highway will be widened to four lanes between Marsh Creek Road and Byron Highway. This statement is in complete conflict with the argument that any widening of the highway comes under a different purview and separate funding requirements. How can you justify adding those lanes for that short distance constitute any safety improvement? All that will do is create another Funnel effect beyond the intersection that will increase the hazard by slow moving trucks that have stopped for the signal light. Tell me how the EIR can justify that probable danger without continuing lanes to the existing four lane section at Discovery Bay. It is obvious that Caltrans has not observed the hazardous situation that occurs east of the stop light at Bixler and high 4 when a semi truck blocks off a stack of cars all of the way back to the intersection while it is trying to get up to speed, otherwise you would not create this absurd proposal.

I strongly urge you to go back to the drawing board and work on getting it right. What is the loss of even one life worth when it could be done right the first time?

*Response: The extra lanes in and around the Discovery Bay area are intended to provide adequate space for deceleration and acceleration at intersections. They are designed to increase safety at these locations and not to relieve regional traffic issues.*

*This project is not funded as a congestion relief project. On SR 4 from 0.2 mile south of Marsh Creek Road to 0.2 mile east of Byron Highway intersection, a new standard lane will be added in westbound direction to match the number of lanes of the SR4 Bypass project and in turn improve traffic operations between the two at the intersections.*

**BS2** It appears that the statistics that you have relied on are completely out of date when you quoted statistics between the years 2000 and 2005. Thats like looking at weather maps of those years and predicting that it will not rain on a given day because it didn't during those years. Since 2005 the truck traffic has increased much more than you are willing to admit. Get up to date statistics or your EIR isn't worth the paper it will be printed on.

**BS3** I get the feeling that your team is trying to accomplish something no matter how inadequate it is. Refusing to explore all avenues of safety in order to get this project approved is a total sham and a waste of tax payers money. The very thought of not including a barrier between the lanes is unconscionable. Your proposal of increasing the size of the lanes will in fact increase the comfort level of the majority of drivers which will increase the speed which will increase the probability of more accidents and fatalities.

**Response:** See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone

### **3.6. Jamison, Richard (RJ), Individual**

**RJ1** The most hazardous problem in our area in terms of human fatalities, severe personal injuries and extended personal property damage seem to be the result of head on accidents. While it may be argued that a median barrier may not reduce accidents, it seems clear that fatalities, personal injuries and property damage would be significantly reduced as a result of a fender bender collision with the barrier than a head on collision at a combined vehicle speed of 110 or more miles per hour.

**RJ2** Reasons given by your staff for not providing some sort of physical barrier in the median included that it wouldn't reduce accidents and cost.

The issue of cost deserves greater consideration.



1. The cost of a median barrier rather than rumble strips can be partially offset by the savings of not installing the rumble strips. Median barriers are manufactured in the east Contra Costa County area and should be readily available.

2. Considering the magnitude of this project, the additional cost, if any of a median barrier rather than median rumble strips may be slight. It was a surprise that the staff was unable to provide some rough estimate of the cost differential inasmuch as the cost seemed to be the most significant factor in not providing the median barrier.

3. If there is a legitimate issue of cost, the suggestion that limiting improvements east of Discovery Bay to provide funding for the median barrier seems to have merit.

4. I would hope that your staff would consider "total cost" of making or not making suggested improvements. A member of the audience noted that two members of their family were injured in a head on accident east of Discovery Bay in San Joaquin County one month ago. Hospitalization costs to date exceed ONE MILLION DOLLARS for just the two members of their family. While this is not a cost to your budget, it is a cost that we all pay in terms of increased insurance premiums not to mention the personal suffering, future physical limitations, possible lost employment income, and property damage.

In conclusion it is worth noting that all members of the CSD Board and all members of the public that spoke to this issue all favor a median barrier. Please reconsider your project to improve the safety of Highway 4 in our community.

**Response:** See section 1. Alternatives to Median Buffer Zone

## Appendix D : Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered Species List

Sacramento Fish & Wildlife Office, Customized Species List Letter

[http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp\\_lists/auto\\_letter.cfm](http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp_lists/auto_letter.cfm)



**United States Department of the Interior  
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**

Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605  
Sacramento, California 95825



March 12, 2007

Document Number: 070312091026

Jonathan Mates-Muchin, PhD  
California Department of Transportation  
111 Grand Avenue  
Oakland, CA 94612

Subject: Species List for CC State Route 4 Median Barrier and Shoulder Project

Dear: Dr. Mates-Muchin

We are sending this official species list in response to your March 12, 2007 request for information about endangered and threatened species. The list covers the California counties and/or U.S. Geological Survey 7½ minute quad or quads you requested.

Our database was developed primarily to assist Federal agencies that are consulting with us. Therefore, our lists include all of the sensitive species that have been found in a certain area *and also ones that may be affected by projects in the area*. For example, a fish may be on the list for a quad if it lives somewhere downstream from that quad. Birds are included even if they only migrate through an area. In other words, we include all of the species we want people to consider when they do something that affects the environment.

Please read Important Information About Your Species List (below). It explains how we made the list and describes your responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act.

Our database is constantly updated as species are proposed, listed and delisted. If you address proposed and candidate species in your planning, this should not be a problem. However, we recommend that you get an updated list every 90 days. That would be June 10, 2007.

Please contact us if your project may affect endangered or threatened species or if you have any questions about the attached list or your responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act. A list of Endangered Species Program contacts can be found at [www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/branches.htm](http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/branches.htm).

Endangered Species Division





Sacramento Fish & Wildlife Office, Species List

[http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp\\_lists/auto\\_list.cfm](http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp_lists/auto_list.cfm)

**Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in  
or may be Affected by Projects in the Counties and/or  
U.S.G.S. 7 1/2 Minute Quads you requested**

Document Number: 070312091026

Database Last Updated: March 5, 2007

**Quad Lists**

**Listed Species**

**Invertebrates**

- Branchinecta conservatio*  
Conservancy fairy shrimp (E)
- Branchinecta longiantenna*  
Critical habitat, longhorn fairy shrimp (X)  
longhorn fairy shrimp (E)
- Branchinecta lynchi*  
Critical habitat, vernal pool fairy shrimp (X)  
vernal pool fairy shrimp (T)
- Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*  
valley elderberry longhorn beetle (T)
- Lepidurus packardii*  
vernal pool tadpole shrimp (E)

**Fish**

- Acipenser medirostris*  
green sturgeon (T) (NMFS)
- Hypomesus transpacificus*  
Critical habitat, delta smelt (X)  
delta smelt (T)
- Oncorhynchus mykiss*  
Central Valley steelhead (T) (NMFS)  
Critical habitat, Central Valley steelhead (X) (NMFS)
- Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*  
Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon (T) (NMFS)  
winter-run chinook salmon, Sacramento River (E) (NMFS)

**Amphibians**

- Ambystoma californiense*  
California tiger salamander, central population (T)
- Rana aurora draytonii*  
California red-legged frog (T)  
Critical habitat, California red-legged frog (X)

**Reptiles**

- Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*  
Alameda whipsnake [=striped racer] (T)
- Thamnophis gigas*  
giant garter snake (T)

**Birds**

- Haliaeetus leucocephalus*  
bald eagle (T)

**Mammals**

- Vulpes macrotis mutica*  
San Joaquin kit fox (E)

**Plants**

1 of 4

3/12/2007 8:13 AM

Sacramento Fish & Wildlife Office, Species List

[http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp\\_lists/auto\\_list.cfm](http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp_lists/auto_list.cfm)

*Lasthenia conjugens*  
*Contra Costa goldfields* (E)  
*Critical habitat, Contra Costa goldfields* (X)

Candidate Species

Fish

*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*  
*Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon* (C) (NMFS)

Quads Containing Listed, Proposed or Candidate Species:

WOODWARD ISLAND (463A)  
BRENTWOOD (463B)  
BYRON HOT SPRINGS (463C)  
CLIFTON COURT FOREBAY (463D)

County Lists

No county species lists requested.

Key:

(E) *Endangered* - Listed as being in danger of extinction.  
(T) *Threatened* - Listed as likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.  
(P) *Proposed* - Officially proposed in the Federal Register for listing as endangered or threatened.  
(NMFS) Species under the Jurisdiction of the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service. Consult with them directly about these species.  
*Critical Habitat* - Area essential to the conservation of a species.  
(PX) *Proposed Critical Habitat* - The species is already listed. Critical habitat is being proposed for it.  
(C) *Candidate* - Candidate to become a proposed species.  
(V) Vacated by a court order. Not currently in effect. Being reviewed by the Service.  
(X) *Critical Habitat* designated for this species



## Important Information About Your Species List

### How We Make Species Lists

We store information about endangered and threatened species lists by U.S. Geological Survey 7½ minute quads. The United States is divided into these quads, which are about the size of San Francisco.

The animals on your species list are ones that occur within, or may be affected by projects within, the quads covered by the list.

- Fish and other aquatic species appear on your list if they are in the same watershed as your quad or if water use in your quad might affect them.
- Amphibians will be on the list for a quad or county if pesticides applied in that area may be carried to their habitat by air currents.
- Birds are shown regardless of whether they are resident or migratory. Relevant birds on the county list should be considered regardless of whether they appear on a quad list.

### Plants

Any plants on your list are ones that have actually been observed in the area covered by the list. Plants may exist in an area without ever having been detected there. You can find out what's in the surrounding quads through the California Native Plant Society's online [Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants](#).

### Surveying

Some of the species on your list may not be affected by your project. A trained biologist or botanist, familiar with the habitat requirements of the species on your list, should determine whether they or habitats suitable for them may be affected by your project. We recommend that your surveys include any proposed and candidate species on your list.

For plant surveys, we recommend using the [Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories](#). The results of your surveys should be published in any environmental documents prepared for your project.

### Your Responsibilities Under the Endangered Species Act

All animals identified as listed above are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Section 9 of the Act and its implementing regulations prohibit the take of a federally listed wildlife species. Take is defined by the Act as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect" any such animal.

Take may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or shelter (50 CFR §17.3).

Take incidental to an otherwise lawful activity may be authorized by one of two procedures:

- If a Federal agency is involved with the permitting, funding, or carrying out of a project that may result in take, then that agency must engage in a formal [consultation](#) with the Service.

During formal consultation, the Federal agency, the applicant and the Service work together to avoid or minimize the impact on listed species and their habitat. Such consultation would result in a biological opinion by the Service addressing the anticipated effect of the project on listed and proposed species. The opinion may authorize a limited level of incidental take.

- If no Federal agency is involved with the project, and federally listed species may be taken as part of the project, then you, the applicant, should apply for an incidental take permit. The Service may issue such a permit if you submit a satisfactory conservation plan for the species that would be affected by your project.

Should your survey determine that federally listed or proposed species occur in the area and are likely to be affected by the project, we recommend that you work with this office and the California Department of Fish and Game to develop a plan that minimizes the project's direct and indirect impacts to listed species and compensates for project-related loss of habitat. You should include the plan in any environmental documents you file.

### Critical Habitat

When a species is listed as endangered or threatened, areas of habitat considered essential to its conservation may be designated as [critical habitat](#). These areas may require special management considerations or protection. They provide needed space for growth and normal behavior; food, water, air, light, other nutritional or physiological requirements; cover or shelter; and sites

## **Appendix E : Project Mapping**